

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 20-31 are now pending in this application, with Claims 20, 24, and 28 being independent. By this amendment, Applicant has canceled Claims 1-19, added new Claims 20-31, and amended the specification. No new matter has been added.

The specification stands objected to for various informalities. Applicant has amended the specification to attend to the matters noted in the Office Action as giving rise to the objection.

Claims 4 and 6 stand objected to for various informalities, and Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant submits that these matters are rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims. Furthermore, the matters noted in the Office Action as given rise to the objection and rejection are not present in the newly presented claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdraw of the objection and rejection.

Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,256,650 (Cedar et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,492 (Ariki et al.). Claims 11, 15 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Cedar et al., Ariki et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,987 (Asada). While Claims 1-19 have been canceled, Applicant submits that new Claims 20-31 are allowable over the cited references for the reasons discussed below.

As recited in independent Claim 20, Applicant's invention is directed to a document printing system. The printing system includes a first calculation unit for calculating a font

size based on a scaling factor of an output area and a decision unit for deciding whether the calculated font size is smaller than a minimum font size. A second calculation unit calculates an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum font size, when the decision unit determines that the calculated font size is smaller than the minimum font size. An adjusting unit adjusts the output area based on the expansion ratio calculated.

Independent Claim 24 is directed to a document printing method and independent Claim 28 is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a computer program for document printing. The steps recited in these independent claims correspond generally to the features recited in independent Claim 20.

Thus, with the present invention as recited in the independent claims, if a calculated font size is less than a minimum font size, then an expansion ratio for expanding the font size to the minimum is calculated and the output area is adjusted in accordance with that expansion ratio.

Cedar et al. is directed to a system for causing text to substantially occupy a text frame grid. The Office Action cites this patent as describing the changing of a font size in accordance with a frame size. Applicant submits, however, that Cedar et al. does describe calculating whether a font size is less than a minimum font size, calculating an expansion ration for expanding the font size to the minimum, and adjusting an output area in accordance with that calculated expansion ration.

Ariki et al. is directed to a system for processing a mixture of character blocks and image blocks with respect to document processing. The Office Action cites that patent as describing a process of determining the size of an output area based on the size of output paper. Applicant submits, however, that Ariki et al. does not describe the calculation of an

expansion ration based on whether a font size is less than the minimum font size, and using that expansion ration in determining the size of the output area.

Asada is directed to a font substitution printer. The Office Action takes the position that this document describes the substitution of a Gothic typeface for an existing typeface. Regardless of whether Asada includes such a disclosure, Applicant submits that the document fails to remedy the deficiencies discussed above with respect to the other applied references.


Accordingly, Applicant submits that Cedar et al., Ariki et al., and Asada, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the features of deciding whether a font size is smaller than a minimum font size, calculating an expansion ration for expanding the font to the minimum font size when it is decided that the font size is smaller than the minimum font size, and adjusting the output area based on the calculated expansion ration, as generally recited in independent Claims 20, 24 and 28.

Applicant submits the dependent are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to the independent claims. Further, Applicant submits that the dependent claims recite additional features further distinguishing them from the applied references. Thus, Applicant requests favorable and independent consideration of the dependent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant requests withdrawal of the rejections of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,


Justin J. Oliver
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 44,986

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

JJO/tri

FCHS_WS 1657446v1